

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figures 12A and 12B. This sheet, which includes Figures 12A-12D, replaces the original sheet including Figures 12A-12D.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

**REMARKS**

The Official Action mailed June 23, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for One Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to October 23, 2006. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on June 23, 2006.

Claims 8-37 are pending in the present application, of which claims 8, 14, 20, 26 and 32 are independent. (Although the Office Action Summary shows that claims 1-37 are pending and that claims 1-7 are withdrawn, the Applicant notes that in the *Preliminary Amendment* filed on September 9, 2003, claim 1 was canceled, and in the *Amendment* filed October 7, 2005, claims 2-7 were canceled.) Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 20, 21, 26, 27, 32 and 33 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 1 of the Official Action rejects claims 14-19 and 26-31 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,635,505 to Tanaka. The Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims 14 and 26 of the subject application are patentably distinct from the claims of the Tanaka '505 patent.

As stated in MPEP § 804, under the heading "Obviousness-Type," in order to form an obviousness-type double patenting rejection, a claim in the present application must define an invention that is merely an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the prior art patent, and the claimed subject matter must not be patentably distinct from the subject matter claimed in a commonly owned patent. Also, the patent principally underlying the double patenting rejection is not considered prior art.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Independent claims 14 and 26 of the present application recite that a first

semiconductor layer has a larger width than that of a second semiconductor layer. The claims of Tanaka '505 do not teach or suggest that a first semiconductor layer has a larger width than that of a second semiconductor layer. It is respectfully submitted that the claims of the present application are not a timewise extension of the invention as claimed in the Tanaka '505 patent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejections are requested.

Paragraph 2 of the Official Action asserts that "[t]here is no description of layer 1755 in figure 18A" (page 2, Paper No. 20060612). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The "passivation film 1755" is already described at page 41, lines 16-21.

Paragraph 2 of the Official Action asserts that "[t]here is no description of layers 4204, 4025, 4027 in figure 25 B" (page 2, Paper No. 20060612). Initially, it is noted that "4204" does not appear in Figure 25B; however, the Official Action appears to be referring to reference number "4024." In response, the paragraph beginning at page 51, line 12, has been amended to clarify that Figure 25B shows "a substrate 4010, an underlying coating 4021, a TFT 4022 for the driving circuit 4024, and a TFT 4023 for the pixel unit 4025." The "pixel electrode 4027" is already described at page 51, lines 20-27. As such, the present specification describes driving circuit 4024, pixel unit 4025 and pixel electrode 4027, which are illustrated in Figure 25B. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Official Action asserts that "[t]here is no gate insulating 1118, and a second impurity 114 in figure 12 A" and "no wiring 1107 in figure 12 B" (page 2, Paper No. 20060612). Initially, it is noted that "114" does not appear in the present specification; however, the Official Action appears to be referring to "second impurity 1114." It is noted that these reference numbers are already provided in Figures 11A, 11D and 11E. In any event, reference numbers "1114" (second impurity region) and "1118" (gate insulating film) have been added to Figure 12A, and reference number "1107" (gate wiring) has been added to Figure 12B. Also, in Figure 12A, reference number "1120" was incorrect and has been corrected by changing it to "1115" (second

impurity region). As such, gate insulating film 1118 and second impurity region 1114 are clearly labeled in Figure 12A, and gate wiring 1107 is clearly labeled in Figure 12B. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are requested.

Paragraph 5 of the Official Action rejects claims 8-37 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,719,065 to Takemura. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because the Official Action has not established an anticipation rejection.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, to establish an anticipation rejection, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be described either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).


The Official Action asserts that Takemura teaches "forming first and second semiconductor layers 102, 103" (page 3, Paper No. 20060612). However, Takemura teaches "a silicon oxide film" (column 4, line 63), which is a type of insulating film and which is not a semiconductor layer. Therefore, Takemura does not teach forming a first semiconductor layer 102, either explicitly or inherently.

Also, independent claims 8, 14, 20, 26 and 32 have been amended to recite a pair of first impurity regions with a channel formation region interposed therebetween; a pair of second impurity regions with the pair of first impurity regions interposed therebetween; and a pair of third impurity regions with the pair of second impurity regions interposed therebetween. The Applicant respectfully submits that Takemura does not teach the above-referenced features of the present invention, either explicitly or inherently.

Since Takemura does not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.  
PMB 955  
21010 Southbank Street  
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165  
(571) 434-6789